arXiv:1611.03244v1 [math.CO] 10 Nov 2016

A $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition of tournaments and bipartite digraphs *

Fangxia Wang, Baoyindureng Wu †, Xinhui An
College of Mathematics and System Sciences, Xinjiang University
Urumqi, Xinjiang 830046, P.R.China

Abstract A $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition of a directed graph D is a partition of the arcs of D into directed paths of length 2. In this paper, we give a characterization for a tournament and a bipartite digraph admitting a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition. This solves a problem posed by Diwan ($\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition of directed graphs, Discrete Appl. Math., http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2016.01.039.).
Keywords: Path-decomposition; Tournaments; Bipartite digraphs; Line graphs; Perfect matchings

1 Introduction

A *decomposition* of a graph G is a family $\mathcal{F}$ of edge-disjoint subgraphs of $G = (V(G), E(G))$ such that $\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} E(F) = E(G)$. In particular, a P_3-decomposition of a graph G is a partition of the edge set of G into paths of length 2.

The same notion of decomposition applies to directed graphs as well, where each arc of D is contained in exactly one element of the decomposition. A $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-*decomposition* of a directed graph D is a partition of the arcs of D into directed paths of length 2. A classical result on decomposition, stated as follows, is due to Kotzig [7].

Theorem 1.1. *A connected graph G has a P_3-decomposition if and only if the size of G is even.*

However, no characterization of directed graphs that admit a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition is known in general. A directed graph is said to be *symmetric* if for every pair of distinct vertices u, v, there is an arc from u to v if and only if there is an arc from v to u. In other words, the directed graph is obtained by replacing each edge in an

*Research supported by NSFC (No. 11571294) and by Xinjiang Talent Youth Project (No. 2013721012)
†Corresponding author. Email: baoywu@163.com (B. Wu)

undirected graph by two oppositely directed arcs. Diwan [4] gave a characterization of symmetric directed graphs that do not admit a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.

Let G be a graph. The line graph of $G = (V(G), E(G))$, denoted by $L(G)$, is the graph whose vertex set is $E(G)$, in which two vertices are adjacent if and only if two edges have an end in common in G. Diwan [4] introduced a similar notion for a digraph D in view of Proposition 1.2 below. We adopt the same notation of the line graph. However, it is defined for a digraph.

Definition 1.1. For a digraph $D = (V(D), A(D))$, the line graph *L(D)* of D is the graph with vertex set $A(D)$, in which two vertices a_1 and a_2 are adjacent if and only if a_1, a_2 induce a directed path of length 2.

A *matching* in a graph is a set of pairwise nonadjacent links. A *perfect matching* is one which covers every vertex of the graph.

The following result is frequently used in the sequel.

Proposition 1.2. *A digraph D has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition if and only if $L(D)$ has a perfect matching.*

By the previous result, the main tools we will use are several classical results in matching theory. For a graph G, $c(G)$, $c_o(G)$ and $i(G)$ denote the number of components, the number of odd components, and the number of isolated vertices of G, respectively.

Theorem 1.3. *(Tutte [13]) A graph G has a perfect matching if and only if $c_o(G-S) \leq |S|$ for all $S \subseteq V(G)$.*

For a graph G, H is called a *fractional perfect matching* of G if H is a spanning subgraph of G such that each component of H is K_2 or a cycle.

Theorem 1.4. *(Tutte [14]) A graph G has a fractional perfect matching if and only if $i(G-S) \leq |S|$ for any $S \subseteq V(G)$.*

For a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, $N(S)$ denotes the set of vertices which are adjacent to vertices of S in G.

Theorem 1.5. *(Hall [6]) A bipartite graph $G[X,Y]$ has a perfect matching which covers every vertex in X if and only if $|N(S)| \geq |S|$ for all $S \subseteq X$.*

Corollary 1.6. *A bipartite graph $G = G[X,Y]$ has a perfect matching if and only if $|X| = |Y|$ and $|N(S)| \geq |S|$ for all $S \subseteq X$.*

In this paper, we give a complete characterization for a tournament and a bipartite digraph admitting a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.

2 Preparations

2.1 Basic terminologies and notations

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph. The *order* and *size* of G are $|V(G)|$ and $|E(G)|$, respectively. We say G is trivial if its order is 1, and nontrivial otherwise. If the size of G is 0, then G is called an *empty* graph. Let $X \subseteq V(G)$. The *induced subgraph* of G induced by X, denoted by $G[X]$, is the subgraph of G whose vertex set is X and whose edge set consists of all edges of G which have both ends in X.

Let $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$. We denote by $E[X, Y]$ the set of edges of G with one end in X and the other end in Y. When $Y = V(G) \setminus X$, the set $E[X, Y]$ is called the *edge cut* of G associated with X, and is denoted by $\partial(X)$. So, a graph is connected if and only if $\partial(X) \neq \emptyset$ for every nonempty proper subset X of $V(G)$.

Let D be a digraph. If $a = (u, v)$ is an arc, then a is said to join u to v; we also say that u *dominates* v. The vertex u is the tail of a, and the vertex v its head; they are the two ends of a. The vertices which dominate a vertex v are its *inneighbours*, those which are dominated by the vertex its *outneighbours*. These sets are denoted by $N_D^-(v)$ and $N_D^+(v)$, respectively.

We say that D is *strict* if there exists no loops or parallel arcs (arcs with the same head and the same tail) in D. We say that D is *asymmetric* if $(u, v) \in A(D)$ for any two vertices $u, v \in V(D)$, then $(v, u) \notin A(D)$. For a set $A' \subseteq A(D)$, the *arc-induced subgraph* $D[A']$ is the subdigraph of D whose arc set is A' and whose vertex set consists of all ends of arcs in A'. We denote by $D \backslash A'$ the spanning subdigraph of D obtained from D by deleting the arcs in A'.

Let $X, Y \subseteq V(D)$. We denote the set of arcs of D whose tails lie in X and whose heads lie in Y by $A(X, Y)$, and their number by $a(X, Y)$. This set of arcs is denoted by $A(X)$ when $Y = X$, and their number by $a(X)$. When $Y = V \setminus X$, the set $A(X, Y)$ is called the *outcut* of D associated with X, and denoted by $\partial^+(X)$. Analogously, the set $A(Y, X)$ is called the *incut* of D associated with X, and denoted by $\partial^-(X)$. Accordingly, we refer to $|\partial^+(X)|$ as the *outdegree* of X and denote it by $d^+(X)$. Similarly, we refer to $|\partial^-(X)|$ as the *indegree* of X and denote it by $d^-(X)$. Observe that $\partial^+(X) = \partial^-(V \backslash X)$. For simplicity, let $\partial(X) = \partial^+(X) \cup \partial^-(X)$. In particular, if $X = \{v\}$, then $\partial^-(X)$, $\partial^+(X)$, $\partial(X)$, $d^-(X)$, and $d^+(X)$ are simply denoted by $\partial^-(v)$, $\partial^+(v)$, $\partial(v)$, $d^-(v)$, and $d^+(v)$, respectively. Since the digraph D under consideration is strict, $d_D^+(v) = |N_D^+(v)|$ $d_D^-(v) = |N_D^-(v)|$ for a vertex $v \in V(D)$.

A digraph D is called *weakly connected* if its underlying undirected graph is connected. We say that D is *strongly connected or strong* if $\partial^+(X) \neq \emptyset$ for every nonempty proper subset X of $V(D)$.

2.2 Connectedness of $L(D)$ for a digraph D

A basic question is that for a digraph D, when is $L(D)$ connected. To answer this question, let us define a digraph D' obtained from D by repeatedly modified

as follows: if there exists such a vertex v with $d_D^+(v) = 0$ and $d_D^-(v) = k \geq 2$, split v into k vertices $v_1, \cdots, v_k$ such that an arc with head v become an arc with head v_i for some i; if there exists such a vertex u with $d_D^-(u) = 0$ and $d_D^+(u) = l \geq 2$, split u into l vertices $u_1, \cdots, u_l$ such that an arc with tail u become an arc with tail u_j for some j. We repeat the operation until no such vertex v or u with the property as described above in the resulting new graph.

Theorem 2.1. *For a strict and asymmetric digraph D without isolated vertices, $L(D)$ is connected if and only if D' is weakly connected.*

Proof. By the definition of D', $L(D) = L(D')$ and for any vertex $v \in V(D')$, $d_{D'}^+(v) = 0$ and $d_{D'}^-(v) = 1$, or $d_{D'}^-(v) = 0$ and $d_{D'}^+(v) = 1$, or $d_{D'}^+(v) \geq 1$ and $d_{D'}^-(v) \geq 1$.

First we prove the necessity by contradiction. Suppose that D' is not weakly connected. Let D_1' be a nontrivial component of D'. Since $E[A(D_1'), A(D') \setminus A(D_1')] = \emptyset$ is an edge cut of $L(D')$, $L(D')$ is disconnected, contradicting the assumption that $L(D')$ is connected.

Next we assume that D' is weakly connected. To show that $L(D')$ is connected, we take two arcs $a = (u, v)$ and $b = (x, y)$ in D'. It suffices to show that there is a path joining a and b in $L(D')$.

Case 1. $x = v$ or $y = u$

Then a, b is a path joining a and b in $L(D')$.

Case 2. $x = u$ or $y = v$.

If $x = u$, then $d_{D'}^+(u) \geq 2$. By the definition of D', $d_{D'}^-(u) \geq 1$. Take an arc $c = (z, u) \in A(D')$, where $z \in N_{D'}^-(u)$. So, a, c, b is a path joining a and b in $L(D')$.

If $y = v$, one may find a path joining a and b in $L(D')$ by the similar way as above.

Case 3. $\{u, v\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$.

By our assumption, we choose a shortest path $P = u_1, \cdots, u_k$ connecting an end of a to an end of b in D'. Without loss of generality, $u_1 = u$ and $u_k = x$. It follows that $v \notin \{u_1, \cdots, u_k\}$ and $y \notin \{u_1, \cdots, u_k\}$ and by the definition of D', $d_{D'}^+(u_i) \geq 1$ and $d_{D'}^-(u_i) \geq 1$ for any i.

Let $A(P) = \partial(\{u_1, \cdots, u_k\})$. Since D is strict and asymmetric, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $L(D')[\partial(u_i)]$ is a complete bipartite graph, and $L(D')[\partial(u_i)]$ and $L(D')[\partial(u_{i+1})]$ have a common vertex. It follows that $L(D')[\partial(u_i) \cup \partial(u_{i+1})]$ is connected and thus $L(D')[\cup_{i=1}^k(\partial(u_i)] = L(D')[A(P)]$ is connected. In particular, a and b is joined by a path in $L(D')[A(P)]$.

□

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.2. *Let T be a tournament of order $n \geq 3$. Then $L(T)$ is disconnected if and only if T has an arc (u, v) with $d_T^-(u) = 0$ and $d_T^+(v) = 0$.*

Proof. If T has an arc (u,v) with $d_T^-(u)=0$ and $d_T^+(v)=0$, then $a=(u,v)$ is an isolated vertex of $L(T)$. Since $n\geq 3$, the order of $L(T)$ is at least 3, and thus $L(T)$ is disconnected.

Now we show its necessity. Observe that there exists at most one vertex u with $d_T^-(u)=0$ and at most one vertex v with $d_T^+(v)=0$. Let T' be the digraph obtained from T as defined in the beginning of this section. As we saw before, $L(T)=L(T')$. One can see that if T has no arc (u,v) with $d_T^-(u)=0$ and $d_T^+(v)=0$, then T' is weakly connected. By Theorem 2.1, $L(T)$ is connected. □

The proof of the following result is easy, and is left to the readers.

Lemma 2.3. *For a digraph D without isolated vertices, $L(D)$ is an empty graph if and only if D is a bipartite digraph with bipartition X,Y such that $X=\{v\in V(D)|\ d_D^-(v)=0\}$ and $Y=\{v\in V(D)|\ d_D^+(v)=0\}$.*

An *orientation* of a simple graph is referred to as an oriented graph. A *tournament* is an orientation of a complete graph. A tournament is called *transitive* if it has no directed cycles.

Theorem 2.4. *For any strict and asymmetric digraph D of order n, $c(L(D))\leq f(n)$, where*

$$f(n)=\begin{cases}\frac{n^2-1}{4}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}\\ \frac{n^2}{4}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even},\end{cases}$$

with equality if and only if either D is the transitive tournament of order 3, or D is the orientation of the balanced complete bipartite graph $G=G[X,Y]$ of order n with $A(D)=A(X,Y)$.

Proof. Let $G_1,\cdots,G_k$ be all components of $L(D)$. We take a vertex $a_i\in V(G_i)$ for each $i\in\{1,\cdots,k\}$. Let $A^*=\{a_1,\cdots,a_k\}$ be an independent set of $L(D)$. By Lemma 2.3, $D^*=(V(D),A^*)$ is a bipartite digraph with a bipartition X^*,Y^* such that $A_{D^*}(X^*,Y^*)=A^*$. Since D is strict and asymmetric, we have $|A^*|\leq |X^*||Y^*|$, $|X^*|+|Y^*|\leq n$, and thus $|A^*|\leq f(n)$, with equality if and only if

$$A^*=\{(x,y)|\ \forall x\in X^*,\forall y\in Y^*)\}\ \textit{and}\ ||X^*|-|Y^*||\leq 1. \tag{1}$$

So, $c(L(D))=|A^*|\leq f(n)$.

Now assume that $c(L(D))=f(n)$. Then $|A^*|=f(n)$ and

$$A^*=\{(x,y)|\ \forall x\in X^*,\forall y\in Y^*)\}\ \textit{and}\ ||X^*|-|Y^*||\leq 1.$$

Therefore, $D^*=(V(D),A^*)$ is the orientation of the balanced complete bipartite graph $G=G[X^*,Y^*]$ of order n with $A(D^*)=A(X^*,Y^*)$.

Case 1. $\min\{|X_1^*|,|Y_1^*|\}\geq 2$

We show that $D=D^*$. Suppose that $D\neq D^*$. Since D is a strict and asymmetric digraph, there exists an arc a with both its head and tail lying in X^*

or Y^*. Without loss of generality, let $a = (x_1, x_2)$ be such an arc. Since $|Y^*| \geq 2$, then both (x_2, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) are adjacent to (x_1, x_2), contradicting the fact that (x_2, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) lie in the different components of $L(D)$. This proves $D = D^*$.

Case 2. $\min\{|X_1^*|, |Y_1^*|\} = 1$

Without loss of generality, let $|X_1^*| = 1$. If $|Y_1^*| = 1$, there is nothing to be proved. If $|Y_1^*| = 2$, then either $D = D^*$ or D is the transitive tournament of order 3.

Conversely, assume that D is the transitive tournament of order 3, or D is the orientation of the balanced complete bipartite graph $G = G[X, Y]$ of order n with $A(D) = A(X, Y)$. It is straightforward to check that $c(L(D)) = f(n)$.

□

3 Tournament

Theorem 3.1. *Let D be a digraph. Then $L(D)$ has a fractional perfect matching if and only if*

$$a(X, Y) \leq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z)$$

for any partition X, Y, Z of $V(D)$.

Proof. To show its necessity, we assume that $L(D)$ has a fractional perfect matching. For a partition X, Y, Z of $V(D)$, let $S = A(Y, X) \cup A(X) \cup A(Y) \cup A(Z, X) \cup A(Y, Z)$. Note that $i(L(D) - S) \geq a(X, Y)$. By Theorem 1.4 we have

$$a(X, Y) \leq i(L(D) - S) \leq |S| = a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z).$$

We prove the sufficiency by contradiction. Suppose that $L(D)$ has no fractional perfect matching. By Theorem 1.4, there exists a subset $S \subseteq V(L(D))$ such that $i(L(D) - S) > |S|$. Let I be the set of isolated vertices in $L(D) - S$. Then $|I| = i(L(D) - S)$. Since I is an independent set of $L(D)$, by Lemma 2.3 $D[I]$ is a bipartite digraph such that $I \subseteq A(X, Y)$, where X is the set of tails of arcs in I and Y is the set of heads of arcs in I. Let $Z = V(D) \setminus (X \cup Y)$.

Moreover, $A(Y, X) \cup A(X) \cup A(Y) \cup A(Z, X) \cup A(Y, Z) \subseteq S$. Combining the above, we have

$$a(X, Y) \geq i(L(D) - S) > |S| \geq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z),$$

a contradiction.

□

Diwan [4] asked the characterization of tournaments with $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition. Indeed, we show that for a tournament T, $L(T)$ has a perfect matching if and only if it has a fractional perfect matching.

Theorem 3.2. *A tournament T of an even size has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition if and only if*

$$a(X,Y) \leq a(Y,X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z,X) + a(Y,Z)$$

for any partition X, Y, Z of $V(T)$.

Proof. If T has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition, then $L(T)$ has a perfect matching. Thus, $L(T)$ has a fractional perfect matching. By Theorem 3.1, the result follows.

We next prove the sufficiency. In order to do so, it suffices to show that $L(T)$ has a perfect matching. Suppose that $L(T)$ has no perfect matching. By Theorem 1.3, there exists a subset $S \subseteq L(T)$ such that $c_o(L(T) - S) > |S|$. We choose the subset S with two additional properties: (1) $c_o(L(T) - S) - |S|$ is maximum and (2) subject to (1), $|S|$ is as large as possible.

Claim 1. Each component of $L(T) - S$ is odd.

Suppose that $L(T) - S$ has an even component C. Take a vertex v in C. Let $S' = S \cup \{v\}$. It is clear that $c_o(L(T) - S') \geq c_o(L(T) - S) + 1$, and thus $c_o(L(T) - S') - |S'| \geq c_o(L(T) - S) + 1 - |S| - 1 = c_o(L(T) - S) - |S|$, contradicting the choice (2) of S. This proves Claim 1.

Let I be the set of isolated vertices in $L(T) - S$. As defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1, $T[I]$ is a bipartite digraph such that $I \subseteq A(X,Y)$, where X is the set of tails of arcs in I and Y is the set of heads of arcs in I. Let $Z = V(T) \backslash (X \cup Y)$. By the choice of S, $I = A(X,Y)$ and $A(Y,X) \cup A(X) \cup A(Y) \cup A(Z,X) \cup A(Y,Z) \subseteq S$.

Let $H_1, \cdots, H_k$ be all nontrivial components of $L(T) - S$. By Claim 1, they are odd. So, $c_o(L(T) - S) = i(L(T) - S) + k = a(X,Y) + k$.

For convenience, let $S_1 = A(Y,X) \cup A(X) \cup A(Y) \cup A(Z,X) \cup A(Y,Z)$ and $S_2 = S \backslash S_1$. Let $T' = T \backslash S_1$, as shown in Figure 1. Note that $L(T) - S = L(T') - S_2$.



Fig. 1. $T' = T \backslash S_1$

Since for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, H_i is nontrivial, there is a directed path P_i of length 2 in T' such that $L(P_i) \subseteq H_i$. Let z_i be the central vertex of P_i. Clearly, $z_i \in Z$ with $d^+_{T'}(z_i) > 0$ and $d^-_{T'}(z_i) > 0$. Note that $\partial(z_i) \subseteq V(H_i)$ and $\partial(z_i) \cap V(H_j) = \emptyset$ when $i \neq j$. It follows that the arc connecting z_i and z_j belongs to S_2 and thus $|S_2| \geq \binom{k}{2}$.

We consider following four cases.

Case 1. $k \geq 3$

So, $|S| = |S_1| + |S_2| \geq c_o(L(T) - S) - k + \binom{k}{2} \geq c_o(L(T) - S)$, contradicting $c_o(L(T) - S) > |S|$.

Case 2. $k = 2$

So, $|S| = |S_1| + |S_2| \geq c_o(L(T) - S) - 2 + 1 = c_o(L(T) - S) - 1$. Since $c_o(L(T) - S) - 1 \geq |S|$, $c_o(L(T) - S) - 1 = |S|$, which contradicts the fact that $|S|$ and $c_o(L(T) - S)$ have the same parity.

Case 3. $k = 1$

Since $c_o(L(T) - S) = i(L(T) - S) + 1 = a(X, Y) + 1$, $|S| = |S_1| + |S_2| \geq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z)$ and $c_o(L(T) - S) \geq |S| + 2$, we have $a(X, Y) \geq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z) + 1$, contradicting our assumption that $a(X, Y) \leq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z)$.

Case 4. $k = 0$

It means that each component of $L(T) - S$ is singleton. We have $c_o(L(T) - S) = i(L(T) - S) = a(X, Y) \leq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z) = |S|$, contradicting that $c_o(L(T) - S) > |S|$. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let T be a tournament of order $n \geq 3$. If T has an arc (u, v) with $d_T^-(u) = 0$ and $d_T^+(v) = 0$, then T has no $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.*

Proof. Let us consider the partition $X = \{u\}$, $Y = \{v\}$, $Z = V(T) \setminus \{u, v\}$ of $V(T)$. Note that $a(X, Y) = 1$, $a(Y, X) = a(X) = a(Y) = a(Z, X) = a(Y, Z) = 0$. So, $a(X, Y) \leq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z)$ fails. By Theorem 3.2, T has no $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.

□

Corollary 3.4. *Let T be a tournament of order $n \geq 3$. If $V(T)$ has a partition X, Y such that $||X| - |Y|| \leq 1$ and $A(X, Y) = \{(x, y) | \ \forall x \in X, \forall y \in Y\}$, then T has no $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.*

Proof. Let $Z = \emptyset$ and we consider the partition X, Y, Z. Note that $a(X, Y) = f(n)$, as defined in the statement of Theorem 2.4, where

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{n^2-1}{4}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{n^2}{4}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} , \end{cases}$$

and $a(Y, X) = a(Z, X) = a(Y, Z) = 0$ and

$$a(X) + a(Y) = \begin{cases} \frac{(n-1)^2}{4}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{n}{2}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} , \end{cases}$$

Again $a(X, Y) \leq a(Y, X) + a(X) + a(Y) + a(Z, X) + a(Y, Z)$ fails. By Theorem 3.2, T has no $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.

□

4 Bipartite digraph

A graph (digraph) is bipartite if its vertex set can be partitioned into two subsets X and Y so that every edge (arc) has one end in X and one end in Y. In this section, we give a characterization for a bipartite digraph with $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition.

Theorem 4.1. *A bipartite digraph $D = D[X, Y]$ has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition if and only if*

$$d^+(X) = d^-(X)$$

and

$$a(X_1, Y_1) + a(Y_1, X_1) \leq d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1)$$

for any $X_1 \subseteq X, Y_1 \subseteq Y$.

Proof. Let $X' = A(X, Y), Y' = A(Y, X)$. Since $D = D[X, Y]$ is a bipartite digraph, both X' and Y' are independent sets of $L(D)$. So, $L(D) = L(D)[X', Y']$ is a bipartite graph. By Proposition 1.2, D has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition if and only if $L(D)$ has a perfect matching.

First, we assume that D has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition. For two subsets $X_1 \subseteq X, Y_1 \subseteq Y$, let $S = A(X_1, Y_1)$. Clearly, $S \subseteq X'$. One can see that

$$N_{L(D)}(S) = \partial^-(X_1) \cup \partial^+(Y_1)$$

and thus

$$|N_{L(D)}(S)| = d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1) - a(Y_1, X_1).$$

By Proposition 1.2 and Corollary 1.6, $d^+(X) = d^-(X)$ and

$$a(X_1, Y_1) = |S| \leq |N(S)| = d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1) - a(Y_1, X_1).$$

Equivalently,

$$a(X_1, Y_1) + a(Y_1, X_1) \leq d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1)$$

for any $X_1 \subseteq X, Y_1 \subseteq Y$.

Conversely, to prove that D has a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition, it suffices to prove that $L(D)$ has a perfect matching. For any $S \subseteq X'$, let X_1 be the set of tails of arcs in S and Y_1 be the set of heads of arcs in S. Clearly, $S \subseteq A(X_1, Y_1)$ and $N_{L(D)}(S) = \partial^+(Y_1) \cup \partial^-(X_1)$. Since

$$a(X_1, Y_1) + a(Y_1, X_1) \leq d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1),$$

we conclude that

$$|N_{L(D)}(S)| = d^+(Y_1) + d^-(X_1) - a(Y_1, X_1) \geq a(X_1, Y_1) \geq |S|$$

By Corollary 1.6, $L(D)$ has a perfect matching. □

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we give a complete characterization for a tournament and a bipartite digraph admitting a $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposition. However, the general case still remains to be unsolved.

Problem 1. ([4]) A simple characterization of all $\overrightarrow{P_3}$-decomposable digraphs.

It is interesting that we established, in Theorem 3.1, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a fractional perfect matching in $L(D)$ of a digraph D. Recall that a path or a cycle which contains every vertex of a graph is called a *Hamilton path* or *cycle* of the graph. A graph is *hamiltonian* if it contains a Hamilton cycle. It is well known that the problem of deciding whether a given graph is hamiltonian is $\mathcal{NP}$-complete [5]. A *directed Euler trail* is a directed trail which traverses each arc of the digraph exactly once, and a *directed Euler tour* is a directed tour with this same property. A digraph is *eulerian* if it admits a directed Euler tour. It is well known that a connected digraph D is eulerian if and only if $d^+(v) = d^-(v)$ for any vertex $v \in V(D)$. Rédei [8] proved that every tournament has a directed Hamilton path. Camion [3] showed that every nontrivial strong tournament has a directed Hamilton cycle.

Theorem 5.1. *If a digraph D of size $m \geq 3$ is eulerian, then $L(D)$ is hamiltonian.*

Proof. Let $v_0, a_1, v_2, a_2, \cdots, a_m, v_0$ be an eulerian trail, where v_{i-1} and v_i is the tail and the head of a_i, respectively, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$ is a Hamilton cycle of $L(D)$. □

The hamiltonian properties of line graphs have been widely studied. Two well-known conjectures in hamiltonian graph theory are due to Thomassen [12] and Matthews and Sumner [10], respectively.

Conjecture 1. (Thomassen [12]) Every 4-connected line graph is hamiltonian.

Conjecture 2. (Matthews and Sumner [10]) Every 4-connected claw-free graph is hamiltonian.

Ryjáček [11] proved that the above two conjectures are equivalent. Very recently, Li et al. [9] investigated a class of spanning subgraphs of a line graph.

Definition 2. Let G be a graph. A graph is called $SL(G)$ if
(1) it is a spanning subgraph of $L(G)$, and
(2) in this graph every vertex $e = uv$ is adjacent to at least $\min\{d_G(u)-1, \lceil \frac{3}{4}d_G(u)+\frac{1}{2}\rceil\}$ vertices of $E_G(u)$ and also adjacent to at least $\min\{d_G(v)-1, \lceil \frac{3}{4}d_G(v)+\frac{1}{2}\rceil\}$ vertices of $E_G(v)$.

Li et al. [9] proposed the following conjecture, and proved that it is equivalent to Conjectures 1 and 2.

Conjecture 3. (Li et al. [9]) Every 4-connected $SL(G)$ is hamiltonian.

Note that $L(D)$ is a spanning subgraph of $L(G)$ for any orientation D of a graph G. So, if $L(D)$ is hamiltonian, then $L(G)$ is hamiltonian. However, there exists a graph G whose line graph is hamiltonian, but $L(D)$ is nonhamiltonian for any orientation D of G. Such an example is shown in Figure 2.



Fig. 2. A graph G whose $L(D)$ is nonhamiltonian any orientation D of G

It is natural to look for some other reasonable necessary or sufficient conditions for the existence of a Hamilton cycle in $L(D)$ for a digraph D. When does $L(T)$ have a Hamilton path or Hamilton cycle for a tournament T ? More generally, one considers the following problem.

Problem 2. Characterize all digraphs D whose line graph $L(D)$ is hamiltonian (or line graph $L(D)$ has a 2-factor or possesses some other properties).

Beineke [1] proved that a graph H is a line graph of a graph if and only if it has no induced subgraph isomorphic to one of the nine graphs as shown in Figure 3.

One naturally poses the following problem.

Problem 3. Characterize those graphs that are line graphs of some digraph.

It is straightforward to check that the line graph of any strict digraph has no an induced subgraph isomorphic to $K_4\backslash e$, which is the graph obtained from K_4 deleting an edge. Moreover, the line graph of any strict asymmetric bipartite digraph has no an induced subgraph isomorphic to $K_{3,3}\backslash e$, which is the graph obtained from $K_{3,3}$ deleting an edge.



Fig. 3. Nine forbidden subgraphs for a line graph

Problem 4. Does there exist a forbidden subgraph characterization for a line graph of some digraph.

References

[1] L.W. Beineke, *Characterizations of derived graphs*, J. Combin. Theory 9 (1970) 129-135.

[2] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol 244, Springer, Heidelberg, 2008.

[3] P. Camion, *Chemins et circuits hamiltoniens des graphes complets*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 249 (1959) 2151-2152.

[4] A.A. Diwan, $\overrightarrow{P_3}$*-decomposition of directed graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math., http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2016.01.039.

[5] M.R. Garey, D.S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: a Guide to the Theory of* $\mathcal{NP}$*-completeness*, Freeman, San Francisco, 1979.

[6] P. Hall, *On representatives of subsets*, J. London Math. Soc. 10 (1935) 26-30.

[7] A. Kotzig, *Aus der Theorie der endlichen regulären Graphen dritten und vierten Grades* (Slovak), Časpis Pěst. Mat. 82 (1957) 76-92.

[8] L. Rédei, *Ein Kombinatorischer Satz*, Acta. Litt. Sci. Szeged 7 (1934) 39-43.

[9] H. Li, W. He, W. Yang, Y. Bai, *Hamiltonian cycles in spanning subgraphs of line graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 209 (2016) 287-295.

[10] M.M. Matthews, D.P. Sumner, *Hamiltonian results in* $K_{1,3}$*-free graphs*, J. Graph Theory 8 (1984) 139-146.

[11] Z. Ryjáček, *On a closure concept in claw-free graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 70 (1997) 217-224.

[12] C. Thomassen, *Reflections on graph theory*, J. Graph Theory 10 (1986) 309-324.

[13] W.T. Tutte, *The factorization of linear graphs*, J. London Math. Soc. 22 (1947) 107-111.

[14] W.T. Tutte, *The factor of graphs*, Can. J. Math. 4 (1952) 314-328.